

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed September 26, 2007. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1 – 4 are pending in the application with Claim 1 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claim 1 is amended and Claims 2 and 4 are canceled. No new subject matter is introduced into the disclosure by way of the present amendment.

I. Objection to the Title of the Invention

The title of the invention is objected to for allegedly not being descriptive. Applicant accepts the Examiners suggested replacement title. Therefore, in response the title of the invention has been amended to recite: “SUPPRESSION OF UNWANTED SIGNAL ELEMENTS BY SINUSOIDAL AMPLITUDE WINDOWING”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the title of the invention.

II. Objection to the Abstract of the Invention

The abstract of the invention is objected to for allegedly reciting legal phraseology. In response, a replacement abstract is submitted reciting:

A method is provided for processing a signal containing regular or quasi-regular elements of unwanted signal. The method establishes timing characteristics of the unwanted signal elements in a portion of the signal. A time domain window function is generated using the established timing characteristics. The generated window function is applied to the signal portion to selectively reduce the amplitude of the unwanted signal elements relative to the amplitude of other elements of the signal.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the abstract of the invention.

III. Objection to the Specification

The specification is objected to for allegedly failing to include sections and section headings. There is no requirement in 35 U.S.C. for sections or section headings in a specification. In fact, even in the MPEP, sections and section headings are merely a suggestion of a preferred layout and not a requirement. However, in an effort to advance prosecution Applicant has amended the specification to include section headings.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1 – 4 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,556,623 issued to Tzannes et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,735 issued to Belotserkovsky et al. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tzannes et al. in view of Belotserkovsky et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,754,101 issued to Daspit et al. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tzannes et al. in view of Belotserkovsky et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,577,686 issued to Koga et al.

Claim 1 has been amended by way of the present amendment to recite the features of Claims 2 and 4, and Claims 2 and 4 have been canceled.

The present Office Action relies on the teaching of Koga et al. for disclosing or suggesting a time domain window function being a sinusoidal function having a zero crossing substantially coinciding with the position of each unwanted signal element as recited in Claim 1.

Rather, Koga et al. discloses calculating a weight for the purpose of reducing or eliminating the amplitude of the interference.

Moreover, Koga et al. discloses adaptive diversity to improve performance against co-channel interference. However, adaptive diversity fails to disclose or suggest Applicant's recited time domain window function being a sinusoidal function having a zero crossing substantially coinciding with the position of each unwanted signal element.

Therefore, for at least the reasons provided above, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the cited prior art references. In addition, Claim 3 depends from independent Claim 1 and thus includes all the limitations recited therein by that independent claim. Consequently, Claim 3 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections with respect to Claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tzannes et al. in view of Belotserkovsky et al. and further in view of either Koga et al. or Daspit et al.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1 and 3 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Spinelli
Registration No. 39,533

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

TS:DAT:jam